DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 115 435 RC 008 891

AUTHOR	Fuller, Theodore E.; Turner, Francis C.
TITLE	A Case Study of Local Needs for Information on Industrial Development. Extension Studies 55.
INSTITUTION	Pennsylvania State Univ., University Park. Cooperative Extension Service.
SPONS AGENCY	Economic Research Service (DOA), Washington, D.C. Economic Development Div.
PUB DATE	Apr 75
NOTE	27p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS	Banking; Case Studies; City Officials; Community Leaders; *Community Surveys; County Officials; *Industry; *Information Needs; Needs Assessment; *Organizations (Groups); *Rural Development; Tables (Data)
IDENTIFIERS	*Pennsylvania

ABSTRACT

In order to identify some basic types of information concerning industrial development which might be useful to decision-makers at the local level, an opinion survey was conducted in five bordering nonmetropolitan Pennsylvania counties. A 13-item questionnaire was mailed to 222 local organizations, categorized by response rate as follows: (1) industrial development groups and chambers of commerce (60 percent); (2) banks (13 percent); (3) county boards of commissioners (40 percent); (4) borough councils (22 percent); (5) township boards of supervisors or planning commissions (23 percent). Questionnaire items included: (1) evaluating desires or needs; (2) estimating benefits and costs; (3) assisting existing industries; (4) establishing industrial development goals; (5) working with prospects; (6) financing; (7) inventory of area resources; (8) utilizing regional organizations; (9) coordinating group efforts; (10) success stories; (11) identifying new prospects; (12) identifying local leadership; and (13) establishing organizations. Major findings indicated that: (1) industrial development groups had the most interest in securing information; (2) banks were very uninterested in industrial development; (3) county commissioners and borough officials were fairly interested; (4) many township officials were not interested in industrial development; and (5) boroughs and townships were most interested in outside and interlocal cooperation and needs assessments. (JC)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED115435

Extension Studies 55, April 1975

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A Case Study of Local Needs for Information on Industrial Development

Theodore E. Fuller
Francis C. Turner

The Pennsylvania State University
Cooperative Extension Service
University Park, Pennsylvania
in cooperation with
Economic Development Division
Economic Research Service
U.S. Department of Agriculture
Washington, D.C.

RC008891

A CASE STUDY OF LOCAL NEEDS FOR INFORMATION ON INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

by

Theodore E. Fuller
Economist
Economic Research Service
U. S. Department of Agriculture

and

Francis C. Turner
Area Resource Development Agent
Cooperative Extension Service
The Pennsylvania State University

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
THE STUDY AREA	1
THE SURVEY	5
SURVEY RESULTS	6
Industrial Development Groups	6
Banks	9
Counties	11
Boroughs	11
Townships	15
Securing Information	17
CONCLUSIONS	17
Major Findings	18
Implications for Research and Education	19
APPENDIX A	21

A CASE STUDY OF LOCAL NEEDS FOR INFORMATION ON INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

Many nonmetropolitan communities currently face problems involving industrial development. Some are seeking industry to alleviate low income or high unemployment problems. Others with a recent record of rapid growth are questioning the desirability of securing additional industry. A concern of those working with community and area groups is what kinds of information are needed to make industrial development decisions.

This paper presents the results of a "case study" designed to identify some basic types of information concerning industrial development that might be useful to decision-makers at the local level. An opinion survey was conducted in one nonmetropolitan area of Pennsylvania of local officials and others involved with industrial development on the kinds of information they thought might be useful in planning for and promoting industrial growth. The results of the survey should be viewed accordingly. Extrapolation of the results to other areas should be made with caution. A presentation of clues rather than conclusions as to local educational needs in industrial development is the intent of this report.

The Study Area

The survey was conducted in the five counties comprising the Northern Tier Regional Planning and Development Commission (NTRPDC).[1] This area is essentially nonmetropolitan in character, containing no center of as many as 10,000 people in 1970. However, five cities ring

---

[1] Counties are Bradford, Sullivan, Susquehanna, Tioga, and Wyoming.

the area on the north, east, and south, placing all five counties within relatively easy commuting distance of at least one center of nearly 50,000 population.[2] These centers provide considerable employment opportunities for residents of the five counties. The close proximity of these centers perhaps moderates pressures for industrial development within the study area itself--especially when the outside centers are prospering and offering job opportunities for area residents.

In the eight years preceding the survey, 1965-73, the combined labor market areas of the NTRPDC and those of the peripheral large centers had good rates of employment growth. Total employment expanded in the five counties by 11.7 percent and by 10.4 percent in the large center labor markets (Table 1), compared to an 11.1 percent growth in Pennsylvania as a whole. Manufacturing employment expanded by 23.5 percent in the NTRPDC counties during the same period but contracted in most of the peripheral large center areas and in Pennsylvania as a whole. Much of the NTRPDC expansion was due to a large new firm in Wyoming County.

Another indicator of the economic well-being of an area and the need for additional industry are unemployment rates. Typically, since 1965, unemployment rates have been somewhat higher in the counties of the NTRPDC than in Pennsylvania and the nation. In 1969, when the national economy was operating at near full employment, unemployment was 4.8 percent in the NTRPDC as opposed to 2.9 and 3.5 percent in Pennsylvania and the nation respectively (Table 2). In the recession

---

[2]The five cities are Elmira (46,500) and Binghamton (75,900) in New York on the north, Scranton (103,600) and Wilkes-Barre (58,900) in Pennsylvania on the east and Williamsport (37,918) on the south.

Table 1. Trends in Total Employment and Manufacturing Employment in Labor Market Areas of the NTRPDC and the Peripheral Centers to Which NTRPDC Residents Commute, 1965-73

	Total Employment				Manufacturing Employment			
	Number		Change 1965-73		Number		Change 1965-73	
Labor Market Area	1965	1973	Number	Percent	1965	1973	Number	Percent
NTRPDC Areas								
Dushore-Laporte	2,100	1,800	-300	-14.3	700	500	-200	-28.6
Tunkhannock	5,300	8,200	2,900	54.7	1,100	3,300	2,200	200.0
Susquehanna County	9,100	8,900	-200	-2.2	2,200	2,000	-200	-9.1
Wellsboro	11,200	11,900	700	6.3	2,700	2,400	-300	-11.1
Sayre-Athens-Towanda	17,500	19,750	2,200	12.6	4,800	6,000	1,200	25.0
Total	45,200	50,500	5,300	11.7	11,500	14,200	2,700	23.5
Peripheral Areas								
Wilkes-Barre	124,100	142,500	18,400	14.8	47,400	49,500	2,100	4.4
Scranton	88,000	96,800	8,800	10.0	32,300	31,400	-900	-2.8
Binghamton	115,000	121,900	6,900	6.0	44,500	39,900	-4,600	-10.3
Elmira	39,200	41,700	2,500	6.4	14,300	14,100	-200	-1.4
Williamsport	45,900	52,000	6,100	13.3	19,800	19,400	-400	-2.0
Total	412,200	454,900	42,700	10.4	158,300	154,300	-4,000	-2.5
Pennsylvania	--	--	--	11.1	--	--	--	-0.9

Source: Pennsylvania Department of Labor and Industry and New York Department of Labor.

Table 2. Rates of Unemployment in Labor Market Areas of NTRPDC and he Peripheral Centers o Which NTRPDC Residents Commute, Selected Years 1965-73

Labor Market Area	Percent Unemployed				
	1965	1969	1971	1973	1974 (December)
NTRPDC Areas					
Dushore-Laporte	4.5	4.5	5.3	5.3	10.0
Tunkhannock	8.6	5.9	7.3	6.8	13.1
Susquehanna County	6.2	6.3	9.3	7.3	9.4
Wellsboro	3.4	4.9	6.3	7.0	9.0
Sayre-Athens-Towanda	5.4	3.5	9.0	3.9	7.9
Total	5.4	4.8	8.0	5.8	9.3
Peripheral Areas					
Wilkes-Barre	6.3	3.9	6.3	4.9	10.2[b]
Scranton	6.9	4.1	6.4	5.2	
Binghamton	3.9	3.5	7.7[a]	4.3[a]	4.8[c]
Elmira	4.2	4.4	7.6[a]	6.4[a]	7.0[c]
Williamsport	3.6	3.4	6.0	4.2	7.8
Pennsylvania	4.4	2.9	5.2	4.3	7.1
United States	4.5	3.5	5.9	4.8	6.7

Source: Pennsylvania Department of Labor and Industry and New York Department of Labor.

[a]Figures are not annual averages but for month of March so they may be slightly above annual average.

[b]Luzerne, Lackawanna and Monroe Counties were recently combined into one labor market area named "Northeast."

[c]November 1974.

of 1971 and even through the partial recovery of 1973 unemployment rates were generally higher in the NTRPDC than in the peripheral centers, Pennsylvania or the nation. This suggests that there might be some concern for expanding economic activity and employment in the five counties of the study area. Attracting new industry is, of course, one possible means of doing so.

The Survey

The purpose of the survey was to secure some insights on basic types of information relating to industrial development operations desired by community or area decision-making groups. A questionnaire was designed listing 13 categories of information potentially useful in making development decisions (Appendix A). Respondents were asked to indicate whether they could use information in each of the following 13 categories.

1. Evaluating the need for or desire for further industrial development in your community or area.
2. Estimating possible benefits and costs to community or area of various types and amounts of new industry.
3. Identifying and enlisting local leadership and support for industrial development.
4. Establishing a formal operational organization for industrial development.
5. Making an inventory of community or area characteristics and resources useful in industrial development efforts.
6. Establishing specific goals for the industrial development of your community or area.
7. Ways to finance industrial development including government sources and local fund raising.
8. Utilizing the services of regional development commissions, electric utility development departments, and state agencies concerned with economic development.

9. Possible advantages and disadvantages of coordinating development efforts with other local development groups including county and regional organizations.

10. Identifying new industry suspects and prospects.

11. Working with industry prospects.

12. Assisting the expansion of existing industry in your community or area.

13. "How to" or "how not to" stories of the experiences of other communities in industrial development.

The respondents were also asked to indicate a 1, 2, 3, etc. priority for their "yes" answers.

Survey Results

The questionnaire was sent to 222 local governmental and other types of organizations including township supervisors, borough councils, industrial development authorities, county boards of commissioners, and banks (Table 3). Fifty-nine or 27 percent of the questionnaires were returned. There were notable variations in both rates and types of response among groups.

Industrial development groups

Questionnaires were sent to 17 industrial development groups and three chambers of commerce. Twelve of these responded (Table 3). This was the highest return rate from any type of organization surveyed which probably reflects their primary concern with industrial promotion.

Typically, the industrial development groups had been organized for at least 10 to 15 years. In spite of their length of operation over half these groups indicated they could definitely or possibly use information on all but one of the 13 items. (Table 4) A ranking of their responses suggested that they were most interested in information

Table 3. Number of Questionnaires on Industrial Development Information Needs Mailed to and Returned by Various Types of Organization

Type of Organization	Number of Questionnaires		Percent of Questionnaires Returned
	Mailed	Returned	
Industrial development groups and chamber of commerce	20	12	60
Banks	30	4	13
County boards of commissioners	5	2	40
Borough councils	46	10	22
Township boards of supervisors or planning commissions	121	28	23
Unidentified respondents	--	3	--
Total	222	59	27

Table 4. Response of 10 Industrial Development Groups and Two Chambers of Commerce on Preferences for Information on 13 Items Concerning Industrial Development. Items listed in order of respondent preferences.

Questionnaire Item[c]	Number of Responses			Percent of Responses "Yes" or "Maybe"	Rank Score[a]
	Yes	Maybe	No		
Identifying new prospects	9	1	2	83	19
Inventory of area resources	8	2	2	83	18
Evaluating desires or needs	6	3	3[b]	75	15
Estimating benefits and costs	6	3	3	75	15
Working with prospects	7	1	4	67	15
Establishing industrial development goals	6	2	4	67	14
Financing	6	2	4	67	14
Coordinating group efforts	5	4	3	75	14
Success stories	4	4	4	67	12
Utilizing regional organizations	4	4	4	67	12
Assisting existing industries	4	3	5	58	11
Identifying local leadership	5	1	6[b]	50	11
Establishing organizations	--	2	10	17	2

[a]Ranking of items was first approximated by "rank score." Rank score for an item was secured by valuing a "yes" response--2, a "maybe"--1 and a "no" or no response--0. If two or more items had the same rank score they were further differentiated by totaling the 1, 2 and 3 priority listing of the "yes" responses on the questionnaires and weighting a 1-3 points, a 2-2 points and a 3-1 point. Unfortunately not all questionnaires gave a priority rank to their "yes" responses as requested. Perhaps half did so and these were the ratings used to break ties in the rank score.

[b]Includes one "no response" to item.

[c]Questionnaire item is abbreviated. See page 5 for complete item description.

on the highly practical problems of identifying industry prospects and inventorying community resources. Similar emphasis on finding prospects was expressed by industrial development groups in the NTRPDC in 1972.[3] This is to be expected of groups whose main goal is securing industry for a community or area. Information on evaluating the need or desire for further industry in their areas and on estimating the benefits and costs of new industry were also important concerns. This suggests that these groups are not only concerned with securing industry but with appraising whether their communities need industry and what the impacts of added industrial firms might be. It indicates they are not indiscriminately seeking new industry.

Banks

The response from banks operating in the NTRPDC did not indicate much interest in information on industrial development. Only four of 30 banks returned the questionnaire (Table 3). Indeed, one of the four banks returning a questionnaire stated they did not need information on any of the questionnaire items since they were not involved in industrial development activities. This may be due in part to the tight money markets of 1974. The small size of the banks may also discourage active participation in industrial financing. Among the banks responding, evaluating the need for further industrial development in their communities, estimating community benefits and costs from new industry plus information on how to help existing industry expand appeared most important (Table 5).

---

[3] "Survey of Industrial Development Organizations in the Northern Tier Region" published by Northern Tier Regional Planning and Development Commission, Towanda, PA, April 1972.

Table 5. Response of Four Banks on Preferences for Information on 13 Items Concerning Industrial Development. Items listed in order of respondent preferences.

Questionnaire Item	Number of Responses			Percent of Responses "Yes" or "Maybe"	Rank Score	Responses "Yes" or "Maybe" - Percent of Total Questionnaires Distributed[a]
	Yes	Maybe	No			
Evaluating desires or needs	3	--	1	75	6	10
Estimating benefits and costs	3	--	1	75	6	10
Assisting existing industries	3	--	1	75	6	10
Establishing industrial development goals	2	1	1	75	5	10
Working with prospects	2	1	1	75	5	10
Financing	2	--	2	50	4	7
Inventory of area resources	1	2	1	75	4	10
Utilizing regional organizations	2	--	2	50	4	7
Coordinating group efforts	1	2	1	75	4	10
Success stories	1	1	2	50	3	7
Identifying new prospects	1	1	2	50	3	7
Identifying local leadership	1	1	2	50	3	7
Establishing organizations	--	2	2	50	2	7

[a]This column represents the most conservative interpretation possible of the survey results. All groups which did not return the questionnaire are assumed to have not been interested in information on any of the items. Presumably a 100 percent return of the questionnaires would have resulted in higher percentages than these if those that did respond were at all representative of the total population.

Counties

Two of five county boards of commissioners returned questionnaires and appeared most interested in information on identifying industry prospects, working with prospects, and helping the expansion of existing industry, in that order (Table 6). Since there were only five counties in the district it is unfortunate that the other three boards did not respond. The results are rather inconclusive.

Boroughs

Questionnaires were sent to 46 borough councils in NTRPDC and 10 responded. Many of the boroughs are quite small, often having populations under 1,000 or even less than 500 (Table 7). The population of boroughs having a manufacturing plant (or plants) in 1972 increased rapidly. The proportion of boroughs returning questionnaires was somewhat higher for the middle-size boroughs than the very small areas. Only 17 percent of the boroughs under 500 population returned questionnaires and these were essentially not interested in any of the information items. One reason that more did not return questionnaires may be that often boroughs had local industrial development groups. Officials may have thought the problem of new industry was therefore not their concern.

Fifty to 70 percent of all 10 boroughs returning questionnaires stated either they definitely or possibly could use information on all items. The main items of interest were advantages and disadvantages of coordinating development programs with groups in their areas, using the services of regional and state agencies concerned with industrial development, and evaluating the need for further industrial development (Table 8). The priority of these items suggests that the small boroughs

Table 6. Response of Two County Boards of Commissioners on Preferences for Information on 13 Items Concerning Industrial Development. Items listed in order of respondent preferences.

Questionnaire Item	Number of Responses			Percent of Responses "Yes" or "Maybe"	Rank Score	Responses "Yes" or "Maybe" — Percent of Total Questionnaires Distributed
	Yes	Maybe	No			
Identifying new prospects	2	--	--	100	4	40
Working with prospects	2	--	--	100	4	40
Assisting existing industries	1	1	--	100	3	40
Estimating benefits and costs	1	1	--	100	3	40
Establishing industrial development goals	1	--	1	50	2	20
Utilizing regional organizations	1	--	1	50	2	20
Inventory of area resources	1	--	1	50	2	20
Identifying local leadership	1	--	1	50	2	20
Financing	1	--	1	50	2	20
Success stories	--	1	1	50	1	20
Coordinating group efforts	--	1	1	50	1	20
Evaluating desires or needs	--	--	1	50	1	0
Establishing organizations	--	--	2	0	0	0

Table 7. Number and Percent of Boroughs in NTRPDC Grouped by 1970 Population Having Manufacturing Plants in 1972 and Returning Questionnaires

Population	Total Number	Had Manufacturing Plant(s)		Returned Questionnaires	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent
0-499	18	7	39	3	17
500-999	11	8	72	4	36
1,000-2,499	12	11	92	2	18
2,500-4,999	4	4	100	1	25
5,000-9,999	1	1	100	--	--
Total	46	31	67	10	22

Source: Survey results and Pennsylvania Industrial Census, Department of Commerce, Harrisburg, 1972.

Table 8. Response of 10 Borough Councils on Preferences for Information on 13 Items Concerning Industrial Development. Items listed in order of respondent preferences.

Questionnaire Item	Number of Responses			Percent of Responses "Yes" or "Maybe"	Rank Score	Responses "Yes" or "Maybe"- Percent of Total Questionnaires Distributed
	Yes	Maybe	No[a]			
Coordinating group efforts	7	--	3	70	14	15
Utilizing regional organizations	7	--	3	70	14	15
Evaluating desires or needs	6	1	3	70	13	15
Inventory or area resources	6	--	4	60	12	13
Identifying new prospects	6	--	4	60	12	13
Working with prospects	6	--	4	60	12	13
Estimating benefits and costs	5	1	4	60	11	13
Establishing industrial development goals	5	--	5	50	10	11
Financing	5	--	5	50	10	11
Identifying local leadership	3	3	4	60	10	13
Success stories	4	1	5	50	9	11
Assisting existing industries	3	2	5	60	8	11
Establishing organizations	2	3	5	50	7	11

[a]Indicates one or two "no responses" in most items.

of the district are seeking ways to combine industrial development plans with others and to secure help from outside agencies. Also, the problem of assessing local need or desire for industry received emphasis, as it did from banks and industrial development groups.

Townships

Questionnaires were sent to 121 township boards of supervisors, and 28 responded; 12 of the 28 indicated no desire for information on any of the 13 items (Table 9). Officials of a number of townships who returned questionnaires stated there was little if any local interest in industrial development, which factor may have led other officials not to return their questionnaires; many boards of supervisors may not consider industrial development as one of their official functions.

However, a study conducted in 1968 showed that township supervisors thought industrial development was needed or should be improved. In the Northern Tier counties, 56 percent of the township officials indicated that industrial development was needed. It could be that economic priorities have changed since that time or that a different set of township officials replied to this survey.[4]

The most important concerns seemed to be using the services of regional and state agencies in industrial development, "how-to" stories from other communities, and evaluating the need or desire for industrial development in their areas.

---

[4]John W. Bergstrom, T. E. Fuller, and E. J. Brown, "Services and Facilities Needed by Pennsylvania Townships as Seen by Township Officials," Extension Studies No. 42, The Pennsylvania State University, College of Agriculture Cooperative Extension Service, 1968, p. 44.

Table 9. Response of 28 Township Boards of Supervisors or Township Planning Commissions on Preferences for Information on 13 Items Concerning Industrial Development. Items listed in order of respondent preferences.

Questionnaire Item	Number of Responses			Percent of Responses "Yes" or "Maybe"	Rank Score	Responses "Yes" or "Maybe" — Percent of Total Questionnaires Distributed
	Yes	Maybe	No[a]			
Utilizing regional organizations	7	6	15	46	20	11
Success stories	8	3	17	39	19	9
Evaluating desires or needs	8	1	19	32	17	7
Coordinating group efforts	7	3	18	36	17	8
Inventory of area resources	6	2	20	29	14	7
Estimating benefits and costs	5	3	20	29	13	7
Financing	5	2	21	25	12	6
Identifying new prospects	4	4	20	29	12	7
Identifying local leadership	4	3	21	25	11	6
Establishing industrial development goals	2	7	19	32	11	7
Assisting existing industries	4	2	22	21	10	5
Working with prospects	3	4	21	25	10	6
Establishing organizations	1	4	23	18	6	4

[a]Includes one or two "no responses" on most items.

Securing Information

A question was also included as to how groups which were interested in information on various aspects of industrial development would like to secure it. Those who answered the question gave meetings of two to three hours as the first choice (Table 10). Home study courses with group meetings were next.

Table 10. Preferences of Respondents by Type of Organization as to How They Would Like to Secure Information on Items Concerning Industrial Development[a]

Type of Organization	Home Study Course	Meetings of 2-3 Hours	Workshops of 1-2 Days	Home Study Courses With Group Meetings	No Response
Industrial development groups and chambers of commerce	1	6	--	1	3
Banks	1	1	1	--	--
County boards of commissioners	--	2	--	--	--
Borough councils	1	1	--	3	3
Township boards of supervisors or planning commissions	3	4	--	4	5
Total	6	14	1	8	11

[a]Questionnaires returned indicating respondent could not use information on any of 13 items are not included.

Conclusions

This survey of industrial development information needs perceived by local government and private groups was made in a fairly limited

nonmetropolitan area of Pennsylvania closely ringed by five cities of metropolitan size. The rate of response was good for a mail questionnaire, but the actual number of respondents left something to be desired. With small numbers it is especially hard to know how to classify those who do not return questionnaires. Were they not interested in the information items, or for some other reason did not return the survey form? For many of the items there could be varying levels of detail or sophistication in the information respondents had in mind as needed. No allowance was made for this sort of differentiation.

Even in the light of the above reservations, the responses do provide some tentative assessment of the industrial development information needs, and offer clues for exploring development of research and education programs.

Major findings

A number of implications for research and education stood out. Industrial development groups had the most interest in securing information on the very practical problems of locating prospects and inventorying community resources. Banks seemed quite uninterested in industrial development at least in the present times of tight money and economic uncertainty. County commissioners and borough officials had fairly high response rates. A much smaller proportion of township officials returned questionnaires and many indicated that they were not interested in industrial development. In boroughs and townships emphasis was placed on learning more about outside and interlocal cooperation in industrial development and assessing the need or desire for more industry in their areas.

Implications for research and education

Reasons for the rather low response rate of townships and banks should be explored. Do township officials consider additional employment opportunities and income a low priority need in their jurisdictions, or that industrial development is needed but is the responsibility of other local groups or interests? Maybe they are opposed to industrial development per se but would support other types of economic development. If industrial development is thought desirable by township officials what roles might they perform in the process? The low response of banks raises the question of whether this was just a reaction to our current depressed economy or a general lack of involvement by small town banks in industrial development.

The major concerns of townships and boroughs were for information on assessing needs for industrial development, using regional organizations in development, and coordinating with other local governmental and private groups. Estimating benefits and costs of new industry was a high response item for the borough and township officials as well as industrial development groups. The emphasis on information to aid in assessing local need or desire for industry implies that both local officials and industrial development groups could use guidelines on how to determine how much of what kinds of industry communities can profitably accommodate. This could include assistance in surveys of local public opinion on desirable economic growth goals. Estimating the benefits and costs of additional industry presents a challenge to research and education personnel to design models that local officials or their planning staffs can use to assess impacts of industry change. There may also be a need to determine if the goals of industrial

development groups are similar to those of local officials and the general public relative to the expansion of industry in local communities. If discrepancies exist, maybe an actual assessment of community needs will help bring groups together toward a common target.

The stress on more information on using regional agencies to aid in local industrial development and to coordinate development with other local groups implies that materials on the pros and cons of interlocal and regional coordination could be of value. Research may be needed to assemble such information.

In summary, the survey, even with its imperfections, did indicate some priorities among information needs in industrial development by type of group at the local level. Further analysis of the extent and nature of these needs should be useful. It well may be that research and education programs can be designed that will increase the efficient pursuit of local development. Local officials, private groups, and citizens might benefit as well as various state and federal agencies administering industrial development programs in nonmetropolitan areas.

APPENDIX A

INFORMATION NEEDS OF YOUR ORGANIZATION
ON INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

The items below cover the main activities and problems of community development groups. They range in sequence from getting organized to working with prospects. Please indicate in the right hand column whether or not your group needs information on the various items.

	Our Organization Could Use Information		
	Yes	No	Maybe
1. Evaluating the need for or desire for further industrial development in your community or area.			
2. Estimating possible benefits and costs to community or area of various types and amounts of new industry.			
3. Identifying and enlisting local leadership and support for industrial development.			
4. Establishing a formal operational organization for industrial development.			
5. Making an inventory of community or area characteristics and resources useful in industrial development efforts.			
6. Establishing specific goals for the industrial development of your community or area.			
7. Ways to finance industrial development including government sources and local fund raising.			
8. Utilizing the services of regional development commissions, electric utility development departments, and state agencies concerned with economic development.			

	Our Organization Could Use Information		
	Yes	No	Maybe
9. Possible advantages and disadvantages of coordinating development efforts with other local development groups including county and regional organizations.			
10. Identifying new industry suspects and prospects.			
11. Working with industry prospects.			
12. Assisting the expansion of existing industry in your community or area.			
13. "How to" or "how not to" stories of the experiences of other communities in industrial development.			

14. Other information (please specify) _____

_____

_____

_____

How would you like to secure the information needs you have indicated above?

Home study course _____
Meetings (2-3 hours) _____
Workshops (1 or 2 days) _____
Home study course with group meetings ____

INFORMATION ON YOUR ORGANIZATION

1. What is the main function of your organization?

   Industrial development _____ Planning _____
   Other (please specify) _____

2. Name and address of your organization.

   Name _____

   Address _____

   _____

3. Name and title of chief officer. _____

4. Community or area served by your organization. (If area served is less than a county, list townships and boroughs covered. If area served covers a full county or more, list counties.) _____

_____

_____

(Questions 5 and 6 to be answered only by industrial development groups.)

5. Does your organization employ professionals? Yes _____ No _____
(If yes, how many are employed Full-time? _____ Part-time _____)

6. How many years has your organization been engaged in industrial development activities? _____